

August 8, 2003

Dear County Superintendents, Institutions of Higher Education Directors, and Private Organization Executive Officers:

**REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL PROVIDERS OF  
SCHOOL ASSISTANCE AND INTERVENTION TEAMS (SAIT)  
FOR STATE-MONITORED SCHOOLS**

The purpose of this Request for Applications is to invite California County Superintendents Educational Service Areas (CCSESA) Regions with a lead county, county offices of education, institutions of higher education and California non-governmental organizations with expertise in K-12 public education to submit proposals to be approved as providers of intervention and support services for state-monitored schools identified under the Public Schools Accountability Act Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP).

Any California educational organization, either public or private, may bid to field one or more SAIT teams at one or more grade spans to conduct academic reviews and provide intensive support at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. Individual school districts may not bid to field SAIT teams.

California Education Code Sections 52055.5 and 52055.51 are the governing authorities defining this work. The law states that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall assume all the legal rights, duties, and powers of the governing board with respect to II/USP schools deemed state-monitored. Several options are then open to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education. For a description of these options please refer to Attachment E, which provides the full text of E.C. 52055.5 and 52055.51.

As an alternative, Education Code 52055.51 (a), allows the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with the approval of the State Board of Education, to require the district to enter into a contract with a School Assistance and Intervention Team. This Request for Applications (see pages 18-19) seeks to identify potential providers of School Assistance and Intervention Teams.

August 8, 2003

Page 2

For an overview of the application and selection process, including key dates, please see pages 1- 2 of the application packet.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sue Stickel".

SUE STICKEL

Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction Branch

SS:wh

Attachments:

Request for Applications, which describes the scope of intended work

- A. Letter of Intent form
- B. SALT timeline
- C. Application Cover Sheet
- D. Assurances
- E. Text of Education Code Sections 52055, 52055.5 and 52055.51
- F. Presentation of Data
- G. Rubric

***REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS***  
***for Providers***  
***of***  
***School Assistance and Intervention Teams***

Authorized by

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT  
[E.C. 52055.51(a-f)]

**August 8, 2003**

**Prospective Providers Conference**  
State Personnel Board  
801 Capitol Mall, Room 150  
**Wednesday, August 20, 2003, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

**Letter of Intent Due at**  
California Department of Education  
Intervention Assistance Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 4401  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
**Friday, August 22, 2003 by 5 p.m.**

**Proposal Due at**  
California Department of Education  
Intervention Assistance Office  
**1430 N Street, Suite 4401**  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
**Friday, September 19, 2003 by 5 p.m.**

# Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>Overview .....</b>	<b>Page 1</b>
	– Eligibility Requirements	
	– Selection Process	
	– Providers Conference	
	– Letter of Intent	
	– Appeal Process	
	– Required Training	
<b>II.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Differentiating the K-8 SAIT: a two level process .....</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Sharpening the focus of the 9-12 SAIT Process .....</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Scope of Work.....</b>	<b>Page 5</b>
	• Team Composition .....	Page 5
	• Team Qualifications .....	Page 6
	• Team Function K-8	
	▪ Level I Investigation.....	Page 7
	▪ Level II Investigation .....	Page 8
	▪ Reporting .....	Page 9
	▪ Supporting .....	Page 10
	▪ Monitoring.....	Page 11
	• Team Function High School	
	▪ Level I Investigation.....	Page 12
	▪ Level II Investigation .....	Page 13
	▪ Reporting .....	Page 14
	▪ Supporting .....	Page 14
	▪ Monitoring .....	Page 15
<b>VI.</b>	<b>District Role .....</b>	<b>Page 15</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Financial Support .....</b>	<b>Page 16</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Documentation .....</b>	<b>Page 17</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Provider Application .....</b>	<b>Page 18</b>

***Request for Applications***  
**to provide**  
**School Assistance and Intervention Teams**

**OVERVIEW**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this Request for Applications is to identify California organizations with the capacity to field School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT) to investigate, provide support for, and monitor “state-monitored schools,” as defined by California Education Code 52055.51 (a).

**Authority for Interventions:** Based upon API growth performance, the state will, in November 2003, identify Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools (II/USP), including schools participating in the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD), for interventions. One of the interventions to be considered by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education will be a School Assistance and Intervention Team as defined by E.C. 52055.51 (a-f). A copy of the text is attached (Attachment E) and is posted on the California Department of Education (CDE) website (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/i/iusp>; click on the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program in the California Law section).

**Eligibility to be a SAIT Provider:** California County Superintendents Educational Service Areas (CCSESA) Regions with a lead county, County Offices of Education, accredited California colleges and universities, and California based non-governmental organizations may apply for state approval to function as providers of one or more School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT).

**Selection Process:** On July 10, 2003, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved criteria for SAIT Providers. This Request for Applications (RFA) is based on those criteria. Potential Providers are urged to review the RFA and then:

- Attend a Providers Conference on **August 20, 2003**, from 9:30 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. at the State Personnel Board, 801 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA, Room 150. Attending the Providers Conference does not obligate the organization to submit an application.
- Attend a workshop on “How to Write a Successful SAIT Application.” The workshop will be conducted on **August 20, 2003** (after the Providers Conference) from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the California Department of Education, 1430 N Street, Sacramento, Room 1101. Attending the workshop is voluntary.

- Submit a Letter of Intent to CDE by 5:00 p.m. on **August 22, 2003**, to the Intervention Assistance Office, 1430 N Street, Suite 4401, Sacramento, CA 95814. The Letter of Intent may be faxed to (916) 319-0125. Submitting a letter of intent does not obligate the organization to submit a proposal.
- Submit a proposal. Three copies of the completed proposal are due to the CDE by the close of business (5:00 P.M.) on **September 19, 2003**. Proposals may be delivered or mailed to the CDE, Intervention Assistance Office, at 1430 N Street, Suite 4401, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Each application will be read and scored by two readers using an evidence-based rubric (see Attachment G). Based on this review, CDE will post approved Providers on the CDE Web site (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/i/iusp>) by October 10, 2003, and a confirmation letter will be mailed shortly after this date.

**Appeal Process: Prospective Providers who are unsuccessful in the first round may appeal this finding. Notice of plan to appeal must be received in writing by October 15, 2003. Applicants who have filed an appeal and still want to field a SAIT team in the 2003-04 year must attend one of the two trainings in October or November at their own expense. Unfortunately, Providers revising their applications will not be notified of their appeal status until November 21, 2003. There are two appeal options:**

1. If the organization believes that the application was not scored appropriately, a request may be made for the application to be re-read and re-scored. With this request, two CDE staff will re-read and re-score the application. The new score will be final. The applicant will be notified of the status of their appeal by October 29, 2003. If this option is chosen, the applicant will not be able to resubmit a revised application.
2. If the applicant would like an opportunity to revise the application to better address the scoring rubric, written notification must be received by October 15, 2003. The revised application must be re-submitted by 5:00 p.m. on November 10, 2003. The revised application will be read and scored and applicants so notified by November 21, 2003.

**SAIT Training:** All approved Providers and Leads are required to participate in state training at their own expense and will be expected to then train their own local SAIT team members. Training will be provided October 20-24, 2003 in Sacramento at the Red Lion Inn and November 3-7, 2003, in Southern California, location to be determined.

**Next Steps:** Following the training and preparation of the appropriate local grade span team(s), the SAIT Provider will contract with local school districts, conduct initial (level I) and intensive (level II) investigations, report findings and corrective actions, provide or arrange intensive support and technical assistance for the school, and monitor the school's progress toward meeting expected student achievement gains and corrective action benchmarks.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Some changes have been made to the SAIT process since the 2002-03 school year. The additional requirements are intended to help focus the SAIT process more clearly on the goal of intervention and support to improve student achievement.

Most of the schools identified as state-monitored lack one or more of the following components essential to school success:

- Coherent and focused academic policies and organization for supporting a comprehensive, standards-aligned academic program based upon State Board-adopted or aligned instructional materials
- District and site leadership to support a comprehensive standards-aligned academic program
- Full academic standards-aligned programs and materials in every classroom and appropriate interventions available
- Use of student assessment data to systematically improve and inform instruction and achievement
- Agreements about the implementation, pacing, and monitoring of academic instruction
- Ongoing content-specific professional development opportunities aligned to the specific instructional materials in use at the school (e.g., approved AB 466 professional development or AB 75 principal training).

Each of these components of a standards-based educational program needs to be implemented in these state-monitored schools to ensure that students have the opportunity to achieve proficiency in California's academic standards. In order to do so, the SAIT process needs to be strategically focused on how schools are teaching reading, writing, language arts and mathematics and how other courses in the school support consistent use of these gateway curricula.

Prospective SAIT Providers will be required to:

- Submit an application to review a particular grade span or grade spans (e.g., elementary, middle, secondary) in a SAIT-assigned school
- Demonstrate knowledge and expertise in the instructional and subject matter programs to be reviewed at the school
- Field Leads with documented experience as a teacher, counselor, administrator, content expert, coach, or coordinator of experts or coaches for any grade span that the Lead will review.

Providers who choose to conduct a K-8 SAIT must provide assurance that the team will have a high degree of knowledge and skill in the K-8 instructional programs in mathematics and reading/language arts most recently adopted by the State Board of Education and that are in use at any of the low performing elementary or middle schools that the SAIT reviews.

Providers who choose to conduct 9-12 SAITs must provide assurance that the team has a high degree of knowledge in standards-aligned English/language arts and mathematics instructional materials, including State Board-adopted reading/language arts interventions.

For all K-12 Providers, assurance must be given that a representative number of team members, which includes the Lead, will have school and/or district teaching and/or administrative experience in the grade span in which the team will be working.

## **DIFFERENTIATING THE K-8 SAIT PROCESS**

The K-8 SAIT process has been differentiated into two levels to accommodate program implementation differences among schools. Not all low-performing elementary and middle schools are alike. Different levels of intervention will be necessary to assist these schools and help them to implement the essential components listed above.

During the Level I investigation, the school and district will complete an Academic Program Survey of the availability of essential program components (see page 8). The SAIT will then spend several days in the district and school verifying the presence of the various essential components. If these components are in place, the SAIT will proceed to Level II. If these components are not in place, the SAIT will work with the district on the initial report of Findings and Corrective Actions based upon the elements in the Academic Program Survey. The school and district will be required to put these components in place. State corrective action resources will be available and technical assistance and monitoring will occur. The Level II investigation may occur after 18 months when the essential program components are in evidence and significant growth has failed to occur.

During the Level II investigation, the SAIT will conduct an onsite investigation to assess instruction in the core program components, based upon the elements in the state's Audit Tool that will be provided as part of the training. For both Level I and Level II, all Reports of Findings will be written, reviewed by the Department of Education, adopted by the local governing board and filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education. Pending availability of revenues in the State Budget, additional state corrective action resources in subsequent years, matched by local revenues, will be available to support implementation of the corrective actions.

SAITs will be expected to provide intensive support and monitor the school's progress throughout the three-year assignment of the team or until the school exits their state-monitored status.

Providers must anticipate that the conduct of a two-level K-8 SAIT will differ based upon the availability of specific resources in the school and the attention that the school has given to implementation of standards-based educational practice.

## **SHARPENING THE FOCUS OF THE 9-12 SAIT PROCESS**

The central issue for the SAIT Provider at the high school is *focus* on academic achievement in English/language arts and mathematics. These two curriculum areas are the gateway to student success in other academic areas and to success on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

High schools are complex organizations. The lack of routine structures to help students functioning far below grade level, the typical isolation of subject matter departments, the



proliferation of extracurricular activities, and the imminence of postsecondary pursuits contribute to the problem. There are any number of issues that *could* be addressed at the high school level. In order to focus the investigation at the high school level, six critical components have been identified (see page 12) to sharpen the high school SAIT. Central attention should be given to English/language arts and mathematics and other courses where curricular, instructional, and assessment expectations support the standards in these two subject areas. Sample activities might include: vocabulary development, writing mechanics, and consistent conventions about use of mathematical formulae across other high school courses.

The high school SAIT will begin with administration of an Academic Program Survey. During the initial phase of investigation, the SAIT will validate the contents of the survey and schedule the intensive investigation of the high school. This will include on-site interviews, classroom observations, and focus groups.

SAITs will be expected to provide intensive support and monitor the school's progress throughout the three-year assignment of the team or until the school exits their state-monitored status.

Note: Although the high school SAIT is focusing more narrowly on literacy issues, i.e., reading, English language arts and mathematics, it is important for SAITs, schools, districts, and communities to understand that the SAIT attends to the entire school and how all curricular areas support student literacy.

Further details for conducting the SAIT are outlined in the Scope of Work and will be discussed in training.

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

### **I. Team Composition**

Teams will be expected to vary in size and composition based upon the size and grade span of the school to be reviewed. A large high school will require a minimum of seven or eight persons on a team; a small elementary, middle, or high school should have no fewer than four on a team. Each prospective provider should bid SAIT services for schools by grade span (e.g. elementary, middle, and/or secondary). Each SAIT shall include the following:

- Representative(s) with expertise in the State Board-adopted or aligned reading/language arts instructional materials, State Board-adopted reading intervention programs, and math instructional materials used by the school
- Representatives, including the Lead, with expertise in the grade span of the school.

In addition, each SAIT may include any of the following persons:

- Certificated County Office of Education staff
- School Principals
- Teachers and Pupil Services Personnel
- Representatives of institutions of higher education

- Representatives of regional educational laboratories and comprehensive regional technical assistance centers
- Representatives of outside consultant groups.

## **II. Team Qualifications**

Each established SAIT shall be composed of persons knowledgeable about current research and practice on standards-based teaching and learning, successful schoolwide projects, effective school reform practices, expertise in the reading/language arts and math instructional materials and/or program(s) used by the school, and improving educational opportunities for low-achieving students. County offices and other organizations are encouraged to form partnerships across county lines in order to best staff SAIT teams(s) with the appropriate expertise. The team must include persons with demonstrated, successful expertise in:

- a. Knowledge of State Board-adopted academic content standards and frameworks
- b. The teaching of standards-based reading, writing, language arts, and mathematics for students by grade span
- c. Knowledge and use of universal access materials and other strategies to help English Learners acquire full academic proficiency in English and meet grade-level standards in the context of state statutory requirements
- d. Knowledge and use of Student Testing and Reporting (STAR) assessments, as well as curriculum-embedded assessments, standardized, criterion-referenced, and other forms of assessment and their use to guide school planning
- e. Accelerated interventions for underperforming students and schools, including the State Board-adopted reading intervention programs
- f. Professional development that addresses standards-based instruction focused on State Board-adopted or aligned instructional materials that are in use at the school
- g. Ability to provide the intensive support necessary for the school to successfully implement recommendations made by the SAIT

In addition, it is suggested that team members have knowledge and skills in the following areas:

- h. Maximizing human and fiscal resources to accelerate the academic achievement of underperforming students
- i. Evaluation and research-based reform strategies
- j. Classroom management and discipline
- k. Effective school management and leadership for “turning around” underperforming schools
- l. Effective communication with parents, students, teachers, staff, and administrators in underperforming schools
- m. Oral and written communication skills

Most of items “h” through “m” are included in Education Code Section 52055.51 (b) and indicate that School Assistance and Intervention Team members should possess a high degree of knowledge and skills in these areas. Both the required and desirable attributes will be assessed in the application process.

### **III. Team Functions—K-8**

School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT) activities are organized into five phases. These include:

1. Conducting an initial Level I investigation, verifying data submitted on an Academic Program Survey, reviewing materials, budgets, plans and academic achievement data on the state-monitored school
2. Conducting a Level II intensive investigation (Note: A Level II investigation may not occur if key academic program components are not in place and the school demonstrates significant growth in the 18-month period provided to install the key components)
3. Preparing a Report of Findings and Corrective Actions
4. Providing intensive support to help the school implement the corrective actions
5. Monitoring the school's progress

All approved Providers are expected to engage in each appropriate SAIT function and adhere to state requirements for completing the investigation, reporting, supporting and monitoring functions. The SAIT Provider may choose to arrange the support requirements, but is responsible for ensuring that those services are delivered. The state-sponsored training will discuss the requirements in detail.

#### **1. Level I: The Initial Investigative Function (K-8)**

The first function is to conduct an initial investigation to assess the availability of key standards-based resources. Sites, with district assistance, will complete an Academic Program Survey of the availability of key resources. The Level I initial investigation will focus on verifying the contents of the Academic Program Survey and collecting and summarizing available achievement, demographic, and programmatic data about the school.

The SAIT will spend several days with district and school staff. One or more district liaisons should be identified to facilitate the communication and support among the team, the district, and the school. The SAIT is expected during this period to develop an understanding with the district liaison(s) about the conduct of the SAIT and to communicate with school and district staff and the community about the status of the state-monitored school and the purpose of the SAIT process. The SAIT's ability to communicate effectively with the district and school throughout the SAIT process is crucial and cannot be overemphasized.

#### **Each Level I investigation shall include:**

- Verification of the data presented in the Academic Program Survey
- Identification of one or more district liaisons
- Communication with the school and district staff and community regarding the purpose of the SAIT
- Analysis of state and local student achievement data, school plans, budgets, and teacher credentials and assignments

**Each K-8 SAIT Level I investigation shall assess the availability of the following key resources:**

- Does the school have core State Board-adopted materials in each grade level?
- To what extent have teachers and principals participated in professional development on teaching the standards-based materials, e.g., AB 466 and AB 75 training?
- Do the district and/or school have common standards-aligned curriculum embedded assessments to provide information to make instructional decisions based upon periodic assessment data in reading, language arts, and mathematics?
- Does the school have State Board-adopted intervention programs?
- Does the school have a pacing schedule for each grade level for the delivery of the instructional program in reading, language arts, and mathematics?
- Does the school/district support and facilitate teacher grade level (K-6) or department level (6-8) collaboration to plan lesson delivery based on assessment data for the adopted instructional programs?
- Are the categorical funds in the school plan matched to the goals of the plan for student achievement?

Each of these questions will be addressed during the training of approved SAIT Providers. However, it is important to understand that the answers to these questions will impact how the SAIT proceeds. If the SAIT finds that the essential components are not in place, the SAIT will develop an initial Report of Findings with corrective actions that will focus on implementing the above components. The Report of Findings and Corrective Actions may recommend the redirection of school and district resources. The SAIT, collaboratively with district and school staff, will then establish benchmarks for each corrective action, including benchmarks for student achievement, and support requirements. Progress toward each corrective action and benchmark must be monitored by the SAIT to ensure that the key components are installed. The school will have until the end of the following school year to demonstrate significant growth. Failure to demonstrate significant growth by this time will result in an intensive Level II investigation.

If the Level I yields evidence that the school has the essential components of a standards-based educational program as described above, the SAIT should talk with the district and the school about moving forward with Level II, the intensive investigation.

## **2. Level II: The Intensive Investigation (K-8)**

The second function of the SAIT work is conducting an intensive investigation, which occurs for a full week at the school site (or four days at smaller sites). The purpose of the intensive investigation is to evaluate the instructional program to assess why students are not more academically successful.

The state's Audit Tool that will be provided as part of the training will be used to conduct the Level II investigation. The full SAIT team will determine from the data collected from the Level I investigation and from classroom observations, interviews, and focus groups conducted at the school site, the most critical issues that must be addressed to raise student achievement in English/language arts and mathematics. Consequently, the Report of Findings and Corrective Actions must focus the district and the school on those activities that will address those critical issues and increase student achievement.

**Each intensive investigation shall:**

- Be conducted for not less than 5 days in a large school and no fewer than four in a small elementary or middle school
- Include interviews with the district about their current support for the school
- Be based upon district and school data on student performance
- Focus on the standards-based teaching of reading, writing, language arts, and mathematics
- Focus on the learning needs of English Learner (EL) students and other students at risk of not meeting state standards
- Include classroom observations and interviews with teachers and administrators
- Include focus groups with school teachers, other faculty and staff, students, parents, and interested community members
- Result in a Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions

**3. Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions**

The third function of the SAIT team is to produce a Report of Findings that will focus the school on improving student achievement. Education Code 52055.51(d) states that not later than 60 days after the assignment of a School Assistance and Intervention Team, the team must have completed an initial report.

If the Level I investigation resulted in an initial Report of Findings, Corrective Actions will focus on implementation of the essential program components. The SAIT will then work collaboratively with district and school staff to establish benchmarks for each corrective action, including benchmarks for student achievement, and support requirements. The initial Report will be submitted to CDE for review and then adopted by the Local Governing Board at a regular meeting.

If the Level I investigation resulted in the SAIT conducting a Level II investigation, the Report of Findings and Corrective Actions should focus on interventions, including the reallocation of district fiscal resources to improve classroom instruction and school leadership and ensure that appropriate resources are targeted to help the school make progress toward meeting the school's growth targets. It is imperative that these reports be explicitly focused on the critical leverage points that will help the school improve the teaching of reading, English/language arts, and mathematics.

**Note: Prior to the submission of any Reports of Findings to the local governing board, the reports must be sent to the California Department of Education for review and subsequently discussed with the district and school staffs.**

It is expected that reports will detail:

- Findings based upon evidence collected at the school
- Corrective actions to strengthen teaching and learning and implement the essential components for each grade span
- Benchmarks that must be achieved by the school in order to successfully implement the corrective actions and improve student achievement

- Benchmarks of support needed from the district and other support providers to help the school meet its growth targets; and
- Proposed reallocation of school and district fiscal resources to ensure that appropriate revenues are targeted to those specific interventions identified in the recommendations of the team for the targeted schools.

Not later than 90 days after the assignment of a SAIT team, the governing board of the school district shall adopt the team's recommendations at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board. (The Department is currently seeking legislative relief to extend this timeline to allow for CDE's review of the proposed corrective actions.) The governing board may not place the adoption on the consent calendar. The report shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education [E.C. Section 52055.51(e)].

#### **4. Support Function**

The fourth SAIT function is to provide intensive support and expertise to implement the corrective actions and benchmarks. The SAIT team shall work with school staff, site planning teams, administrators, and district staff to improve pupil literacy and math achievement for a period of three years unless the school exits state sanctions. Currently, a school must make significant growth for two consecutive years to exit state intervention/sanctions.

The successful product of a Level I SAIT is the installation of the essential components identified in the Academic Program Survey. This is much more than buying State Board-adopted textbooks and scheduling professional development for teachers and the principal. To be sure, the SAIT provider will need to work with the principal and the district to secure these resources, but support is likely to be needed around coaching for implementation of the professional development and assistance for school leaders in making the bi-monthly teacher collaborations effective.

If a Level II investigation was conducted, the SAIT team will be responsible for ensuring that the school receives the necessary support to implement all of the changes required by the SAIT Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions, which includes monitoring key services for quality. For example, if the Report of Findings requires the school to obtain reading and math coaches, the SAIT Provider must inform the district that the coaching services must be provided by qualified content experts in reading/languages arts and mathematics and help the district identify these resources.

In order to assure that support is provided in a timely manner, schools will be required to document the support provided. The CDE has developed a Web-based Online Documentation System that allows services provided to II/USP schools deemed as state-monitored to be documented quickly and easily. The intent is to document all services/staff development provided to the school such as intensive professional development, coaching, workshops, assistance in writing a single school plan, etc.

## **5. Monitoring Requirements**

The fifth SAIT function requires that the team monitor the implementation of the Corrective Actions, no less than three times during the year, for a period of three years, unless the school exits state sanctions. The team will meet with the school district and school site personnel to review district and site data, progress toward the goals established by the team's Corrective Actions and progress toward the improvement of student achievement [Education Code Section 52055.51(e)]. The report must be presented to the local governing board, and subsequently to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education. The data shall be presented to the governing board of the school district, if possible, using existing site data. Every effort should be made to report data in a manner that minimizes the length and complexity of the reporting requirement in order to maximize the focus on improving pupil literacy and achievement.

The SAIT and the district may negotiate additional monitoring occasions based upon the needs of the school. At each review, the SAIT should:

- Conduct an analysis of the school's progress toward the goals established by the team's Report of Findings and Corrective Actions. Evidence to be discussed includes:
  - Growth in student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics
  - Identification of benchmarks attained and not attained toward implementation of essential components for grade span success, with individuals responsible for specific tasks so identified
  - Other actions to continually improve student achievement; and
  - Expected targets for the next report.
- Ensure that the district presents the report to the local governing board, including findings and next steps
- Provide a copy of the report to the Department of Education for the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education

It is important to remember that everyone in the system, including the student, the teacher, the school administration, the district staff, county and state offices, is accountable for his/her role in the improvement process.

## **IV. Team Functions—High School**

High School School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT) activities are organized into five phases. These include:

1. Conducting an initial Level I investigation, verifying data submitted on an Academic Program Survey, reviewing materials, budgets, plans and academic achievement data on the state-monitored school
2. Conducting a Level II on-site investigation
3. Preparing a Report of Findings and Corrective Actions
4. Providing intensive support to help the school implement the corrective actions
5. Monitoring the school's progress

All approved Providers are expected to engage in each appropriate SAIT function and adhere to state requirements for completing the investigation, reporting, supporting and monitoring

functions. The SAIT Provider may choose to arrange the support requirements, but is responsible for ensuring that those services are delivered. The state-sponsored training will discuss the non-negotiable requirements in detail.

### **1. Level I: The Initial Investigative Function (High School)**

The first function is to conduct an investigation to assess the availability of key standards-aligned resources. Sites, with district assistance, will complete an initial Academic Program Survey of key resources. The Level I investigation will focus on verifying the contents of the Academic Program Survey; collecting and summarizing available achievement, demographic, and programmatic data about the school; and informing the school, district, and community about expectations for the state-monitored school.

The SAIT will spend several days with district and school staff. One or more district liaisons should be identified to facilitate communication and support among the team, the district, and the school. During this period the SAIT is expected to develop an understanding with the district liaison(s) about the conduct of the SAIT and to communicate with school and district staff and the community about the status of the state-monitored school and the purpose of the SAIT process. The SAIT's ability to communicate effectively with the district and school throughout the SAIT process is crucial and cannot be overemphasized.

#### **Each Level I investigation shall include:**

- Verification of the data presented in the Academic Program Survey
- Identification of one or more district liaisons
- Communication with the school and district staff and community regarding the purpose of the SAIT
- Analysis of state and local student achievement data, school plans, budgets, and teacher credentials and assignments

#### **Each High School SAIT initial investigation shall assess the following key components:**

- Do the English/language arts and mathematics programs use standards-aligned text and instructional materials? (Initially check at the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades, and subsequently at the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades.)
- Does the school use standards-based interim assessments and use assessment data to guide instruction?
- Does the school use State Board-adopted interventions for students working below standards?
- To what extent is there consistent support for standards in English/language arts and mathematics in other academic content areas, e.g., the use and analysis of informational text in science and social science?
- To what extent have teachers and administrators participated in professional development aligned with the instructional materials?
- Is the master schedule designed so that all students have access to core courses?
- Are the categorical funds in the Single School Plan targeted to the goals of the plan for student achievement?



The Level I high school initial investigation has been expanded and requires the Lead, and potentially other team members, to spend several days gathering information before the Level II intensive investigation begins. The extra time spent gathering information on the above components will help the team shape the intensive investigation as well as reduce the number of unanswered questions during the intensive investigation. If the SAIT determines that the key components, in particular standards-aligned instructional materials, are largely not in place, then the Level II investigation should be postponed until they are in place.

High school teachers and departments structure the professional culture of the school. It will be important for the high school SAIT Provider to assess the extent to which the professional culture of the high school supports or does not support the seven components listed above and recommend corrective actions to create strong, supportive professional cultures committed to a standards-based educational program.

## **2. Level II: The Intensive Investigation**

The second function of the SAIT work is to conduct the intensive investigation, which occurs for a full week at the school site. The purpose of the intensive investigation is to evaluate the instructional program to assess why students are not more academically successful. Given the critical timelines and expectations imposed on high schools, the Level II investigation will occur within 60 days of the assignment of a SAIT to the school by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education.

The SAIT Audit Tool that will be provided as part of the training will be used to conduct the Level II investigation. The full SAIT team will determine from the data collected from the Level I investigation and from classroom observations, interviews, and focus groups conducted at the school site, the most critical issues that must be addressed to raise student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. Consequently, the Report of Findings and Corrective Actions must focus the district and the school on those activities that will address those critical issues and dramatically increase student learning.

### **Each Level II investigation shall:**

- Be conducted for not less than 5 days in a large high school and no fewer than four in a small high school
- Include interviews with the district about their current support for the school
- Be based upon district and school data on student performance
- Focus on the standards-based teaching of reading, writing, language arts, and mathematics in core courses
- Focus on the learning needs of English Learner (EL) students and other students at risk of not meeting state standards
- Include classroom observations and interviews with teachers and administrators
- Include focus groups with school teachers, other faculty and staff, students, parents, and interested community members
- Result in a Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions

### **3. Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions**

The third function of the SAIT work is to produce a Report of Findings that will focus the school on improving student achievement. Education Code 52055.51(d) states that not later than 60 days after the assignment of a School Assistance and Intervention Team, the team must have completed an initial report. The report shall include “recommendations for corrective actions chosen from a range of interventions, including the reallocation of district fiscal resources to ensure that appropriate resources are targeted to those specific interventions identified in the recommendations of the team for the targeted schools to make progress toward meeting the school’s growth target”. It is imperative that these reports be explicitly focused on the critical leverage points that will help the school improve the teaching of reading, English/language arts, and mathematics.

**Note: Prior to the submission of the Report of Findings to the local governing board, the report must be sent to the California Department of Education for review of legal issues and subsequently discussed with the district and school staffs.**

Reports will detail:

- Findings based upon evidence collected at the school
- Corrective actions to strengthen teaching and learning and implement the essential components for each grade span
- Benchmarks that must be achieved by the school in order to successfully implement the corrective actions and improve student achievement
- Benchmarks of support needed from the district and other support providers to help the school meet its growth targets; and
- Proposed reallocation of school and district fiscal resources to ensure that appropriate revenues are targeted to those specific interventions identified in the recommendations of the team for the targeted schools.

Not later than 90 days after the assignment of a SAIT team, the governing board of the school district shall adopt the team’s recommendations at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board. (The Department is currently seeking legislative relief to extend this timeline to allow for review of the recommended corrective actions.) The governing board may not place the adoption on the consent calendar. The report shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education [E.C. Section 52055.51(e)].

### **4. Support Function**

The fourth SAIT function is to provide intensive support and expertise to implement the corrective actions and benchmarks throughout the three-year period or until the school exits state intervention. The SAIT shall work with school staff, site leadership teams (including the School Site Council), administrators, and district staff to improve English/language arts and mathematics achievement. Currently, a school must make significant growth for two consecutive years to exit state intervention/sanctions.

The SAIT will be responsible for ensuring that the school receives the necessary support to implement the recommended changes required by all SAIT Reports of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions, which include monitoring support services for quality. For

example, if the Report of Findings requires the school to obtain reading and math coaches, the SAIT Provider must inform the district that the coaching services must be provided by qualified content experts in reading/languages arts and mathematics and help the school and district identify these resources.

In order to assure that support is provided in a timely manner, schools will be required to document the support provided. The CDE has developed a Web-based Online Documentation System that allows services provided to II/USP schools deemed as state-monitored to be documented quickly and easily. The intent is to document all services/staff development provided to the school such as intensive professional development, coaching, workshops, assistance in writing a single school plan, etc.

## **5. Monitoring Requirements**

The fifth SAIT function requires that the team monitor the implementation of the Corrective Actions, no less than three times during the year, for a period of three years, unless the school exits state sanctions. The team will meet with the school district and school site personnel to review district and site data, progress toward the goals established by the team's Corrective Actions and progress toward the improvement of student achievement [Education Code Section 52055.51(e)]. The report must be presented to the local governing board, and subsequently to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education. According to state statute, the data shall be presented to the governing board of the school district, if possible, using existing site data. Every effort should be made to report data in a manner that minimizes the length and complexity of the reporting requirement in order to maximize the focus on improving pupil literacy and achievement.

The SAIT and the district may negotiate additional monitoring occasions based upon the needs of the school. At each review, the SAIT should:

- Conduct an analysis of the school's progress toward the goals established by the team's Report of Findings and Corrective Actions. Evidence to be discussed includes:
  - Growth in student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics
  - Identification of benchmarks attained and not attained toward implementation of essential components for grade span success, with individuals responsible for specific tasks so identified
  - Other actions to continually improve student achievement; and
  - Expected targets for the next report.
- Ensure that the district presents the report to the local governing board, including findings and next steps
- Provide a copy of the report to the Department of Education for the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education

It is important to remember that everyone in the system, including the student, the teacher, the school administration, the district staff, county and state offices, is accountable for his/her role in the improvement process.

## **DISTRICT ROLE**

All districts are ultimately responsible for their schools and student achievement. Therefore, the district, which has the contract with the SAIT provider, remains responsible for supporting the work of the team and for the implementation of the school's corrective actions. District responsibilities include:

- Procuring an Approved SAIT Provider for the following functions: Level I and Level II investigations, reporting, providing intensive support, and monitoring the implementation of the corrective actions
- Appointment of one or more liaison(s) from the district who will work with the SAIT during each of the five phases of the SAIT process
- Assisting the school in the completion of the Academic Program Survey
- Giving high priority to SAIT schools for resources and services, and to documenting those services
- Providing sufficient recent State Board-adopted instructional materials, intervention programs, embedded assessments and associated professional development to ensure that the components of a successful K-8 school are in place
- Providing sufficient State Board-aligned standards-based instructional materials, including State Board of Education intervention materials and other academically accessible materials (grades 9-12), to scaffold the curriculum for underperforming high school students
- Ensuring that faculty and staff receive appropriate professional development if required in the Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions
- Working with the SAIT team, and any other services providers, to provide services to administrators, teachers and staff at SAIT schools
- Preparing data and, with the SAIT Provider, reporting at least three times annually to the local governing board, the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and the State Board of Education (SBE) on the school's progress

To assist with the expenses associated with the activities above, additional financial resources will be provided through two grants.

## **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

As part of the FY 2003-2004 Budget Act, resources are provided to support the work of the School Assistance and Intervention Team initiative as described below:

- Funds will be allocated to districts with schools requiring School Assistance and Intervention Teams to contract with a state-approved SAIT Provider for investigations, reporting, and monitoring. Elementary and middle schools will receive \$75,000 and high schools will receive \$100,000. The district shall provide an in-kind match of services or a match of district funds in an amount equal to one dollar (\$1) for every two dollars (\$2) received. Districts may request additional funding up to \$125,000 to support the SAIT Team investigation and monitoring functions. The additional funding must be approved

by the Department of Education and the Department of Finance and also requires the two-to-one match.

- Revenues for supporting the implementation of the corrective actions will be funded through a state grant and through re-directed school and district resources. Districts will receive \$150 per student to receive intensive support and help support the costs of implementing the corrective actions in the action plan. The district must provide an in-kind match of services or a match of district funds in an amount equal to the amount received.

### **DOCUMENTATION**

Given the seriousness of the SAIT intervention and the potential for more intrusive sanctions if student achievement does not improve, it will be important for each component of the SAIT process to be documented.

- The district contract with the SAIT Provider documents the SAIT work that will occur.
- The Report(s) of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions documents the necessary changes in the school action plan, including reallocation of school and district resources.
- Each review of data and progress will document school completion of required tasks, attainment of benchmarks, and necessary steps before the next review.
- The state has developed an internet-based, password-protected Web site that will document the support and technical assistance provided or arranged by the SAIT team for the school. Providers will be trained to assist schools who have not occurred this electronic system to document receipt of services.

## **PROVIDER APPLICATION**

Prospective Providers must sign the Assurances (Attachment D) and respond to the questions outlined below. Submit three copies of the application along with the Assurances and the provided cover sheet (see Attachment C) signed by the appropriate organizational representative on/or before September 19, 2003.

***All proposals must be received by 5:00 p.m. on September 19, 2003. Send all applications to:  
California Department of Education  
Intervention Assistance Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 4401  
Sacramento, CA 95814***

In order for organizations to be successful in this application process, an overall average score of 3 or higher is required on the application as well as a score of three or higher for the State Board-approved a-g criteria in question two.

Each prospective provider organization must respond to the questions below. The response to questions 1 and 3 is limited to three pages each. The response to question 2 is limited to four pages and the response to question 4 is limited to two pages for each Lead. The size of the type must be 12 point. All margins should be approximately one inch. Any pages beyond the specified page limit for each question will be removed and will not be considered by the readers.

- 1. What evidence demonstrates your organization's successful experience working with school staff, site planning teams, administrators and district staff in underperforming schools to conduct an investigation, using data, to: 1) assess, refine and revise school action plans; and 2) make recommendations to maximize the use of fiscal and human resources in achieving the goals of the plan? (3 page limitation)**
- 2. What evidence demonstrates your organization's recent success in working with low-performing schools and recent successful expertise in each of the State Board-adopted criteria listed below? (4 page limitation)**  
**The specific areas in which expertise must be demonstrated are:**

- a. Knowledge of State Board-adopted academic content standards and frameworks
- b. The teaching of standards-based reading, writing, language arts, and mathematics for students by grade span
- c. Knowledge and use of universal access materials and other strategies to help English Learners acquire full academic proficiency in English and meet grade-level standards in the context of state statutory requirements
- d. Knowledge and use of Student Testing and Reporting (STAR) assessments, as well as curriculum-embedded assessments, standardized, criterion-referenced, and other forms of assessment and their use to guide school planning
- e. Accelerated interventions for underperforming students and schools, including the State Board-adopted reading intervention programs
- f. Professional development that addresses standards-based instruction focused on State Board-adopted or aligned instructional materials that are in use at the school

- g. Ability to provide the intensive support necessary for the school to successfully implement recommendations made by the SAIT

In addition, what evidence demonstrates your organizations successful experience in each of the following areas:

- h. Maximizing human and fiscal resources to accelerate the academic achievement of underperforming students
- i. Evaluation and research-based reform strategies
- j. Classroom management and discipline
- k. Effective school management and leadership for “turning around” underperforming schools
- l. Effective communication with parents, students, teachers, staff, and administrators in underperforming schools
- m. Oral and written communication skills

**3. What evidence demonstrates your organization’s successful experience providing intensive support to help schools implement a focused standards-aligned academic program in reading/language arts and mathematics? (3-page limitation)**

**4. Identify any individuals whom you plan to field as a “Team Lead.” (2 page limitation per lead)**

- a) **Provide a synopsis of his or her qualifications, which includes data that demonstrates specific expertise in improving reading/language arts and mathematics achievement in low-performing schools. Identify the amount of this individual’s time that will be committed to the SAIT work. (Low-performing schools, for the purposes of this program, are defined as schools in decile ranks 1-5.)**
- b) **In addition, briefly describe the individual’s expertise in working with specific grade spans, e.g., as a teacher, counselor, administrator, coach, or content expert. (Note that a Lead must have some experience at the grade span that the Lead is reviewing.)**

### **Proposal Review Process**

Department staff will be trained to use an evidence-based rubric (see Attachment H) to assess proposals. Anchor papers will be chosen and reviewers will be asked to weight each element in questions one through four (above) relative to the evidence provided documenting contributions to improved student achievement, particularly in underperforming schools. For information on how to present student achievement data in order to score a 3 or higher on the rubric, see Attachment F.

## **Letter of Intent to Apply as a School Assistance and Intervention Team Provider**

After you have reviewed the Request for Applications and determined that your organization can field one or more School Assistance Intervention Team(s), please **return** this **Letter of Intent** to the CDE. The Letter of Intent is optional, but provides information to help CDE plan for application review. Submitting a letter of intent does not obligate the organization to submit a proposal.

This letter of intent should be received by mail or fax no later than Friday, August 22, 2003, at the following address:

*California Department of Education  
Intervention Assistance Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 4401  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
**ATTN: Jenny Singh**  
FAX (916) 319-0125  
Email: jsingh@cde.ca.gov*

\_\_\_\_\_ We intend to submit an application to become a SAIT provider(s).

How many teams does your organization currently plan to field? \_\_\_\_\_

At what grade span(s) do you intend to field teams (if known)?

Elementary      Middle      High      *(Circle all that apply)*

Name of Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail Address \_\_\_\_\_



## ***SAIT Timeline***

<b>July 10, 2003</b>	<b>SBE approves SAIT criteria</b>
<b>August 8, 2003</b>	<b>CDE releases RFA for SAIT Providers</b>
<b>August 20, 2003</b>	<b>Providers Conference and Workshop</b>
<b>August 22, 2003</b>	<b>Letters of Intent due to CDE</b>
<b>September 19, 2003</b>	<b>SAIT Provider proposals due</b>
<b>October 6, 2003</b>	<b>State-approved SAIT Providers posted on Web site</b>
<b>October 15, 2003</b>	<b>Appeals and notification that a revised application will be submitted must be received in writing</b>
<b>October 20-October 24</b>	<b>Training for Providers in Sacramento</b>
<b>November 3-7, 2003</b>	<b>Training for Providers in Southern California (location still to be determined)</b>
<b>November 13, 2003</b>	<b>State Board of Education meets to review SPI's proposals for "state-monitored" schools</b>
<b>November 17, 2003</b>	<b>CDE notices SAIT-required schools and districts</b>
<b>November 17-January 16</b>	<b>SAIT Providers contract with districts and conduct investigations in identified schools</b>
<b>January 17, 2004</b>	<b>SAIT teams must have completed a Report of Findings and Corrective Actions [Education Code 52055.51(d)]</b>
<b>*February 17, 2004</b>	<b>Local Boards must adopt the Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions</b>

\*CDE is pursuing legislation to provide an additional 30 days for local boards to adopt the Report of Findings in order to accommodate the new requirement that CDE review all Reports of Findings before the reports are adopted by local boards.

## **Application Cover Sheet for Providers of School Assistance and Intervention Teams**

**The organization is capable of fielding SAIT Teams for the following grade span(s):**

**Elementary** ☐   **Middle** ☐   **High** ☐

Name of Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax Number: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Authorized Organizational Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Please mail to ensure receipt by **Tuesday, September 19, 2003 by 5 p.m.** to:

**California Department of Education  
Intervention Assistance Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 4401  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

## **SAIT Provider General Assurances**

Potential School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) Providers, by the signature of their authorized representative on this form, make the following assurances:

1. That each SAIT team will have at least one person with expertise in the subject matter and instructional programs in use at the school with which the team will be working. For K-8 SAIT teams, this requires a high degree of knowledge and skill in the State Board-adopted instructional materials in reading, language arts, and mathematics, as well as reading intervention programs in use at the school. For 9-12 SAIT teams, this requires a high degree of knowledge in State Board-aligned English/language arts and mathematics curricula, including any State Board-adopted reading intervention programs in use at the school.
2. That each SAIT team will have a Lead with school and/or district experience in the grade span in which the team will be working.
3. That any individual which served as an External Evaluator for a state-monitored school will not serve as a SAIT Lead for that school.
4. That the Provider is prepared to deliver a differentiated SAIT at any school with which the team is working, if it is deemed necessary. (See Introduction for a discussion of the Differentiated SAIT.)
5. That the Provider is responsible for ensuring the quality of SAIT teams fielded.

Name or Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Authorized Organizational Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

# ***Text of California Education Code***

## **Sections 52055, 52055.5 and 52055.51**

**52055.5.** (a) Twenty-four months after receipt of funding pursuant to Section 52054.5, a school that has not met its growth targets each year, but demonstrates significant growth, as determined by the State Board of Education, shall continue to participate in the program for an additional year and to receive funding in the amount specified in Section 52054.5. Thirty-six months after receipt of funds pursuant to Section 52054.5, a school is no longer eligible to receive funding pursuant to that section.

(b) Twenty-four months after receipt of funding pursuant to Section 52054.5, a school that has not met its growth targets each year and has failed to show significant growth, as determined by the State Board of Education, shall be deemed a state-monitored school.

(1) The State Board of Education shall make its final determination regarding whether or not a school shows significant growth no later than 30 days after the public release of a school's growth in API results or the next regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education following the expiration of the 30 days if meeting the 30-day time limit would not provide the State Board of Education with sufficient time to comply with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code).

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 90 days after the public release of a state-monitored school's growth in API results, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education, shall do the following:

(A) Assume all the legal rights, duties, and powers of the governing board with respect to that school, subject to the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (7) of subdivision (e) and except as provided by Section 52055.51.

(B) Reassign the principal of that school, subject to the findings in subdivision (g).

(3) In addition to the actions specified in paragraph (2), the Superintendent of Public Instruction, after consultation with the State Board of Education, shall do one or more of the following with respect to a state-monitored school:

(A) Revise attendance options for pupils to allow them to attend any public school in which space is available. If additional attendance options are made available, nothing in this option shall be construed to require either the sending or receiving school district to incur additional transportation costs.

(B) Allow parents to apply directly to the State Board of Education for the establishment of a charter school and allow parents to establish the charter school at the existing schoolsite.

(C) Under the supervision of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, assign the management of the school to a college, university, county office of education, or other appropriate educational institution, excluding for-profit organizations. The entity chosen to assume management of the school shall possess the qualifications specified in subdivision (b) of Section 52055.51. Consistent with paragraph (6) of subdivision (e), the involvement of the school district during the sanctions process shall be established by contract. The costs of the entity to manage the school shall be established by contract and shall be paid by the school district. However, the Superintendent of Public Instruction may not assume the management of the school.

(D) Reassign other certificated employees of the school.

(E) Renegotiate a new collective bargaining agreement at the expiration of the existing collective bargaining agreement, pursuant to Section 3543.2 of the Government Code.

(F) Reorganize the school.

(G) Close the school.

(H) Place a trustee at the school, for a period not to exceed three years, who shall monitor and review the operation of the school. The trustee shall possess the qualifications specified in subdivision (b) of Section 52055.51, shall compile an initial report in accordance with the requirements of subdivision (d) of Section 52055.51, and shall receive reports from the school district and schoolsite no less than three times during the year on the progress towards meeting the goals established in the initial report. During the period of his or her service, the trustee may stay or rescind those actions of the governing board of the school district or schoolsite principal that, in the judgment of the trustee, may detrimentally affect the conditions of the state-monitored school to which the trustee is assigned. The salary and benefits of the trustee shall be established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education, and shall be paid by the school district.

(c) When a school is deemed to be a state-monitored school, the governing board of the school district shall, at a regularly scheduled public meeting, inform the parents and guardians of pupils enrolled at the schoolsite that the school is a state-monitored school and that as a result of this determination the corrective actions set forth in subdivision (b) may occur.

(d) In addition to the actions taken pursuant to subdivision (b), the governing board of the school district and the district superintendent shall be included in discussions regarding the governance of the state-monitored schoolsite and the actions that shall be taken in order for the schoolsite to succeed. During the discussions, the participants shall clearly delineate the role that the governing board of the school district and the district superintendent will play during the sanctions period and shall report this delineation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The role to be played by the governing board of the school district and the district superintendent as delineated during the discussions regarding the governance of the state-monitored schoolsite shall be in addition to those actions set forth in subdivision (e).

(e) After a school is deemed to be a state-monitored school pursuant to subdivision (b), the governing board of the school district shall do all of the following:

(A) Make the same fiscal, human, and educational resources, at a minimum, available to the schoolsite as were available before the action taken pursuant to subdivision (b) excluding state or federal funding provided pursuant to Sections 52054.5 and 52055.600. If the total amount of resources available to the school district differs from one year to another, it shall make the same proportion of resources available to the schoolsite as was available before the action taken pursuant to subdivision (b).

(B) The entity selected to manage a school pursuant to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) shall review the resources allocated to the schoolsite and determine if additional resources should be made available from district funds to reasonably support the schoolsite without detriment to the other schools and pupils of the district.

(C) If the school does not have a management team pursuant to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b), the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education, shall designate an entity to review the resources allocated to the schoolsite and determine if additional resources should be made available from district funds to reasonably support the schoolsite without detriment to the other schools and pupils of the district.

(D) If the entity selected to manage a school pursuant to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) or the entity chosen by the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to

subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) is unable to obtain the information necessary to make this determination, the entity may request that the Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education intervene to obtain the necessary documents.

(E) Any dispute between the entity selected to manage a school pursuant to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) or the entity chosen by the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) and the school district over resource allocations shall be resolved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education.

(2) Continue its current ownership status with respect to the schoolsite.

(3) Continue to provide the same insurance coverage as before the action taken pursuant to subdivision (b) with respect to property, liability, error and omissions, and other regularly provided policies.

(4) Name the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education as additional insureds upon transfer of legal rights, duties, and responsibilities to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(5) Continue to provide facilities support, including maintenance if appropriate to the management arrangement, and full schoolsite participation in bond financing.

(6) Remain involved with the school throughout the sanction period.

(7) If the State Board of Education approves, the governing board of the school district may retain its legal rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to that school.

(f) In addition to the actions listed in subdivision (b), the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education, may take any other action considered necessary or desirable against the school district or the school district governing board, including appointment of a new superintendent or suspension of the authority of the governing board with respect to the school or schools identified pursuant to subdivision (b).

(g) (1) Before the Superintendent of Public Instruction may take any action against a principal pursuant to subdivision (b), the Superintendent of Public Instruction or a designee of the superintendent, which may be a panel consisting of the county superintendent of schools of the county in which the school is located or an adjoining county, one principal with experience in a similar type of school, and the superintendent of the school district in which the state-monitored school is located, shall do the following:

(A) Hold an informal hearing to determine whether there are sufficient issues to proceed to a formal hearing. The informal hearing shall be held in a closed session. The principal, and his or her representative, and a school district representative may be present at the informal hearing. The decision on whether to proceed to a formal hearing shall be posted and presented at a regularly scheduled public meeting of the governing board of the school district. If the decision is not to proceed to a formal hearing, the posting and presentation shall explain the rationale for this decision. This item may not be a consent item on the agenda.

(B) Hold a formal hearing on the matter in the school district and make both of the following findings:

(i) A finding that the principal had the authority to take specific enumerated actions that would have helped the school meet its performance goals.

(ii) A finding that the principal failed to take specific enumerated actions pursuant to paragraph (1).

(2) Evidence to support the findings made at a formal hearing held pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall be presented and discussed in a closed session. The principal, or his or

her representative, and a school district representative may be present in the closed session. The findings shall be posted and presented at a regularly scheduled public meeting of the governing board of the school district. This item may not be a consent item on the agenda. The governing board shall give adequate time for public input and response to findings.

(3) The Superintendent of Public Instruction may not take any action against a principal pursuant to subdivision (b) if the principal is assigned to the school for one academic year or less.

(h) A school that has not met its growth targets within 36 months of receiving funding pursuant to Section 52054.5, but has shown significant growth, as determined by the State Board of Education, shall continue to be monitored by the Superintendent of Public Instruction until it meets its annual growth target or the statewide performance target. If, in any year between the third year of implementation funding and the first year the school meets its growth target, the school fails to make significant growth, as determined by the State Board of Education, that school shall be deemed a state-monitored school and subject to the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (10), inclusive, of subdivision (b).

(i) An action taken pursuant to subdivision (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be conducted from funds provided for that purpose in the annual Budget Act and shall not require reimbursement by the Commission on State Mandates.

(j) An action taken pursuant to subdivision (b), (e), or (f) shall be accompanied by specific findings by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education that the action is directly related to the identified causes for continued failure by a school to meet its performance goals. These findings shall be made public and discussed at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board of the school district before the enactment of any action taken pursuant to subdivision (b), (c), or (d).

**52055.51.** (a) Instead of the actions specified in subdivision (b) of Section 52055.5, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with the approval of the State Board of Education, may require the district to enter into a contract with a school assistance and intervention team. If the State Board of Education approves, the governing board of the school district may retain its legal rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to that school.

(b) School assistance and intervention team members should possess a high degree of knowledge and skills in the areas of school leadership, curriculum, and instruction aligned to state academic content and performance standards, classroom management and discipline, academic assessment, parent-school relations, and evaluation and research based reform strategies and have proven successful expertise specific to the challenges inherent in state-monitored schools.

(c) The team shall provide intensive support and expertise to implement the school reform initiatives in the plan. Decisions about interventions shall be data driven. A school assistance and intervention team shall work with school staff, site planning teams, administrators, and district staff to improve pupil literacy and achievement by assessing the degree of implementation of the current action plan, refining and revising the action plan, and making recommendations to maximize the use of fiscal resources and personnel in achieving the goals of the plan. The district shall provide support and assistance to enhance the work of the team at the targeted schoolsites.

(d) Not later than 60 days after the assignment of a school assistance and intervention team, the team must have completed an initial report. The report shall include recommendations for corrective actions chosen from a range of interventions, including the reallocation of district fiscal resources to ensure that appropriate resources are targeted to those specific interventions identified in the recommendations of the team for the targeted schools and other changes deemed appropriate to make progress toward meeting the schools growth target. Not later than 90 days after the API is made public, the governing board of the school district shall adopt the team's recommendations at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board. The governing board may not place the adoption on the consent calendar. The report shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education.

(e) No less than three times during the year, the school district and schoolsite shall present the team with data regarding progress toward the goals established by the team's initial assessment. The data shall be presented to the governing board of the school district at a regularly scheduled meeting. The team shall, to the extent possible, utilize existing site data. The data shall also be provided to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education. Every effort shall be made to report this data in a manner that minimizes the length and complexity of the reporting requirement in order to maximize the focus on improving pupil literacy and achievement.

(f) An action taken pursuant to this section shall not increase local costs or require reimbursement by the Commission on State Mandates.



## Presentation of Data

The primary purpose of the SAIT application process is to determine whether an organization has been successful in assisting low-performing schools to improve student achievement (low-performing schools are defined as schools in state decile ranks 1-5). Organizations must provide disaggregated student achievement data that demonstrates improved student learning in order to obtain a passing score. (Please note: 2003 API data may not be available before the application is due, therefore, it is acceptable to use 2001 and 2002 API data.) A passing score is an overall score of 3 or higher on the application as well as a score of 3 or higher on question two of the application.

Student Achievement data may be disaggregated in two basic ways:

1. By Student Groups
2. By Grade Level

### **Disaggregated Data by Student Groups**

There are multiple ways of presenting data by student groups. Below are three examples of presenting student achievement data by student groups. There are, of course, many more ways to present data than is provided in the examples below. However, regardless of how data is presented, it is important to make sure that the data is provided in a format that is easy to read, shows an increase in student achievement, and is clearly labeled (e.g., percentage above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, growth in API scores, etc.).

#### **Example 1:**

<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> Percentile on STAR Test Results</b>						
<b><u>Summer Middle</u></b>	<b>Math 2001</b>	<b>Math 2002</b>	<b>Gains</b>	<b>Reading 2001</b>	<b>Reading 2002</b>	<b>Gains</b>
All Students	18%	40%	<b>22%</b>	10%	16%	<b>6%</b>
ELL	22%	53%	<b>31%</b>	10%	30%	<b>20%</b>
Low-Income	10%	39%	<b>29%</b>	13%	29%	<b>16%</b>
African-American	16%	31%	<b>15%</b>	17%	32%	<b>15%</b>
Hispanic	24%	57%	<b>33%</b>	12%	34%	<b>22%</b>
Girls	18%	36%	<b>18%</b>	18%	34%	<b>16%</b>
Boys	19%	44%	<b>25%</b>	13%	30%	<b>17%</b>

#### **Example 2:**

<b>Growth in API Score From 2001 to 2002</b>					
<b><u>Elementary School</u></b>	<b>2001 API Base</b>	<b>2002 API Growth</b>	<b>2001-02 Growth Target</b>	<b>2001-02 Actual Growth</b>	<b>2001-02 Growth Beyond Target</b>
All students	427	484	+19	+57	+38
Asian	475	500	+15	+25	+10
Hispanic	401	474	+15	+73	+58
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	427	484	+15	+57	+42

<b><u>Middle School</u></b>	<b>2001 API Base</b>	<b>2002 API Growth</b>	<b>2001-02 Growth Target</b>	<b>2001-02 Actual Growth</b>	<b>2001-02 Growth Beyond Target</b>
All students	525	558	+14	+33	+19
Hispanic	510	554	+11	+44	+33
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	519	558	+11	+39	+28

**Example 3:**

Gains in the National Percentage Ranking (NPR) From 2000 to 2002								
	2000	2002	Difference	% Gain	2000	2002	Difference	% Gain
	Reading				Math			
ALL Students	41	54	13	32	54	69	15	32
Low SES	37	50	13	35	52	66	14	35
EL	31	47	16	52	46	61	15	52

**Disaggregated Data by Grade Span**

Below are three examples on how to present student achievement data by grade span.

**Example 1:**

<b>Growth in Grade Level Performance (50<sup>th</sup> Percentile) on the SAT 9 Math from 2000 to 2002 to State Growth</b>					
	State Growth	School A	School B	School C	School D
2 <sup>nd</sup>	+9%	+38%	+8%	+19%	+12%
3 <sup>rd</sup>	+11%	+13%	+2%	+28%	+36%
4 <sup>th</sup>	+10%	+50%	+22%	+2%	+23%
5 <sup>th</sup>	+9%	+30%	+10%	+5%	+16%

**Example 2:**

<b>Change in National Percentile Ranking by Grade Span from 2000 to 2002</b>									
	Reading			Math			Language		
Grade	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
2	43	45	48	57	62	78	43	41	51
3	36	41	42	47	53	53	45	47	45
4	37	41	53	41	48	68	47	47	58
5	37	33	41	44	49	61	49	41	54
6	33	42	43	54	63	69	47	47	57

### Example of Providing A Specific Example in Response to Questions 1(b)

As we all know, schools often have multiple organizations providing them assistance at the same time to improve student achievement. Therefore, it is extremely important that applicants provide specific examples of how their organization assisted the school in achieving the results reflected in the data.

For example, in 1(b) of the rubric, CDE requests that organizations provide excellent evidence, using specific examples, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in successfully securing commitment from most people within an organization to make **critical and demanding changes**. This requires that the applicant provide a specific example of a demanding change and how the organization was able to obtain commitment from the staff to implement the required change.

*We were able to obtain agreement from teachers at one school to discontinue an unplanned, unmonitored after school “helping students with homework” program and implement an extended day to provide direct instruction for each identified student based upon an analysis of the student’s academic need. Based on the data analysis, 100 students were identified to participate in a structured intervention program after school. Though the recommendation meant that some teachers lost up to \$100 per week in additional salary, all stakeholders, including the union, supported the targeted intervention program. We were able to obtain the commitment to change the after school intervention program because we addressed some of the physical barriers to teaching and learning first. A survey of the school staff revealed that during a recent site modernization, a number of construction mistakes had been made. Electrical plugs were covered over, computer counters installed too high for classroom chairs, and properly sized stools were not ordered. Identifying and correcting these problems first allowed us to make the more difficult recommendation to reorganize the after school intervention program.*

### Example of Providing A Specific Example in Response to Questions 2 (1)

The rubric also requests that organizations provide excellent evidence, using specific examples and disaggregated student achievement data that they have successfully provided or arranged **accelerated, appropriate, and successful academic intervention** programs for at-risk students and schools with large numbers of students achieving below grade-level. Below is an example of an appropriate response.

*Initially we had the school assess students who score in the 0-25% quartile on the STAR test in reading to determine the specific reading needs (decoding, fluency, and/or comprehension). In order to facilitate the assessment process we trained site staff to administer a diagnostic reading assessment and also provided help assessing the students. Once the school had an idea of the reading needs of their students, we helped them review research-proven accelerated reading intervention programs to identify a program that would meet the needs of their students (e.g., SRA Reach, High Point, Language, Fast Track, etc.). This particular school selected SRA REACH; therefore we were able to provide the needed training. Last year, we worked with seven middle schools serving 1,500 students in their reading intervention programs. Pre and post tests showed that schools obtained at least 2.0 years of growth in one year with the average being 2.3 years of growth and the highest being 3.2 years of growth. (Please see disaggregated data provided on page 6.)*

- I What evidence demonstrates your organization's successful experience working with school staff, site planning teams, administrators and district staff in underperforming schools to conduct an investigation, using data, to: 1) assess, refine and/or revise school action plans, and 2) make recommendations to maximize the use of fiscal and human resources in achieving the goals of the plan?

<b>Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified</b>
The description provides <u>excellent evidence, using specific examples</u> , that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence, using examples</u> , that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence, mostly through generalizations</u> , that the organization has staff with expertise in:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:
1(a) Effectively <b>facilitating diverse groups</b> that include persons with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Varying levels of expertise in academics, including parents,</li> <li>• Differing roles and philosophies, and</li> <li>• Differing opinions on the desired approach and/or outcome.</li> </ul>	<b>Facilitating groups</b> that include persons with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Varying levels of expertise in academics,</li> <li>• Differing roles and philosophies, and</li> <li>• Differing opinions on the desired approach and/or outcome.</li> </ul>	Facilitating groups that include a <b>few persons</b> with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Varying levels of expertise, or</li> <li>• Differing roles, or</li> <li>• Differing opinions.</li> </ul>	Facilitating groups with little diversity.
1(b) Successfully securing commitment from <b>most people</b> within an organization to make <b>critical and demanding</b> changes.	Securing commitment from a <b>majority of people</b> within an organization to make <b>necessary</b> changes.	Securing commitment from <b>more than a few people</b> within an organization to make <b>some</b> changes.	Securing commitments from individuals.

## Question I Continued

<b>Level 4</b> <b>Excellent Evidence:</b> <b>Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Adequate Evidence:</b> <b>Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Minimal Evidence:</b> <b>Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Insufficient Evidence:</b> <b>Unqualified</b>
<p>The description provides <u>excellent evidence</u>, using <u>specific examples</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>adequate evidence</u>, using <u>examples</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>minimal evidence</u>, mostly through <u>generalizations</u>, that the organization has staff with expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:</p>
<p>1(c) Successfully using data from <b>multiple sources</b> (academic, fiscal, process, support, etc.) to effectively diagnose school problem areas and to <b>recommend comprehensive focused changes</b> within the school action plan to improve teaching and learning.</p>	<p>Using adequate data from at <b>least two sources</b> (academic, fiscal, process, support, etc.) to diagnose school problem areas and to <b>recommend targeted changes</b> within the school plan to improve teaching and learning..</p>	<p>Using <b>limited data</b> to diagnose school problem areas and to <b>recommend some changes</b> to the school plan (e.g., recommending changes that have little impact on teaching and learning).</p>	<p>Using data to study school problems.</p>
<p>1(d) Successfully analyzing school and district fiscal and human resource allocations to <b>make appropriate and demanding recommendations</b>, which are currently in practice, to maximize resources to effectively implement and achieve the goals of the action plan.</p>	<p>Analyzing school and district fiscal and human resource allocations in order to <b>make appropriate recommendations</b> for reallocating resources to achieve the goals of the action plan.</p>	<p>Analyzing fiscal and human resource allocations in order to <b>make minor recommendations</b> for reallocating resources.</p>	<p>Analyzing school fiscal and human resource allocations to make recommendations for change.</p>

- II. What evidence, including student achievement data, does your organization have that it can field a team or teams with demonstrated successful experience in each of the 13 State Board-adopted criteria below. (Although the response to this question is limited to four pages you may reference other areas of the application, by page and paragraph number, that address one or more of the areas. Readers will be instructed that references to other portions of the application **must be used** in scoring this question.)

Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified	Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified	Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory	Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified
The description provides <u>excellent evidence, using specific examples and disaggregated schoolwide student achievement data</u> , that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence, using examples and disaggregated student achievement data</u> , that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence, mostly through generalizations</u> , that the organization has staff with expertise in:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:
2(a) Working with districts and schools <b>to implement consistent and effective use of specific</b> State Board-adopted mathematics and reading/language arts materials and the frameworks in the classroom, <b>including the effective use of intervention programs and assessments embedded in the adopted materials.</b>	Working with schools <b>to implement the use of</b> the State Board-adopted mathematics and reading/language arts materials and the frameworks in the classroom and having access to at least one person with in-depth knowledge of the materials in use at the school.	Working with districts or schools to <b>secure</b> State Board-adopted mathematics and reading/language arts materials in the classroom, but providing little support for classroom implementation.	Working with districts to secure or implement the use of State Board-adopted mathematics and reading/language arts materials.
2(b) Teaching and supervising the teaching of standards-based curriculum in <b>reading/language arts and math in an organized manner to all students, using a variety of approaches.</b> .	Teaching and potentially supervising the teaching of standards-based curriculum <b>in reading/language arts and math.</b>	Teaching and/or supervising the teaching of <b>subject-matter curriculum.</b>	Teaching and/or supervising the teaching of K-12 students.

## Question II Continued

<b>Level 4</b> <b>Excellent Evidence:</b> <b>Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Adequate Evidence:</b> <b>Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Minimal Evidence:</b> <b>Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Insufficient Evidence:</b> <b>Unqualified</b>
<p>The description provides <u>excellent evidence</u>, using <u>specific examples and disaggregated schoolwide student achievement data</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>adequate evidence</u>, using <u>examples and disaggregated student achievement data</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>minimal evidence</u>, <u>mostly through generalizations</u>, that the organization has staff with expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:</p>
<p>2(c) Helping EL students <b>acquire proficiency in English and academic proficiency in English by meeting grade-level standards in reading/language arts and math</b> through the use of State Board-adopted instructional materials with adopted EL support materials for K-8, appropriate instructional materials for 9-12 and State Board-adopted intervention <b>by implementing an organized and comprehensive academic instructional program using a variety of approaches.</b> (Data is required.)</p>	<p>Helping EL students <b>acquire proficiency in English and academic proficiency in English by meeting grade-level standards in reading/language arts and mathematics</b> through the use of State Board-adopted instructional materials with adopted EL support materials for K-8, appropriate instructional materials for 9-12 and State Board-adopted intervention <b>by using some instructional approaches.</b> (Data is required.)</p>	<p>Helping EL students <b>acquire English proficiency by providing minimal primary language support</b> (oral interpretation, instructional aides, etc.).</p>	<p>Helping EL students acquire English proficiency by providing primary language support.</p>
<p>2(d) Effectively using data from STAR assessments, local assessments and standards-based classroom assessments <b>to recommend and implement comprehensive changes</b> to effectively address the learning needs of all students, especially students at risk of not meeting grade-level standards.</p>	<p>Using data from STAR assessments and other standards-based assessment information <b>to recommend targeted changes</b> to address the learning needs of students.</p>	<p>Using STAR and other assessment data <b>to make recommendations</b> to revise the school plan.</p>	<p>Using assessment information to make recommendations.</p>

## Question II Continued

<b>Level 4</b> <b>Excellent Evidence:</b> <b>Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Adequate Evidence:</b> <b>Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Minimal Evidence:</b> <b>Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Insufficient Evidence:</b> <b>Unqualified</b>
<p>The description provides <u>excellent evidence, using specific examples and disaggregated schoolwide student achievement data</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>adequate evidence, using examples and disaggregated student achievement data</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>minimal evidence, mostly through generalizations</u>, that the organization has staff with expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:</p>
<p>2(e) Providing and ensuring the successful implementation of <b>appropriate accelerated and successful academic intervention programs, including State Board-adopted reading intervention programs</b>, for at-risk students and schools with a large percentage of students achieving below grade-level. (Data is required.)</p>	<p>Providing and implementing <b>accelerated academic intervention</b> programs, including State Board-adopted reading intervention programs, for at-risk students or schools with a majority of students achieving below grade-level standards. (Data is required.)</p>	<p>Providing or brokering <b>intervention programs</b> for students achieving below grade-level standards.</p>	<p>Providing or brokering intervention programs.</p>
<p>2(f) Identifying and providing <b>standards-based</b> professional development in reading, language arts, and math to successfully implement a coherent schoolwide staff development plan and addresses the specific professional development needs of <b>all staff that focused on SBE-approved mathematics and language arts instructions materials</b></p>	<p>Providing <b>standards-based</b> professional development in reading, language arts, and math to implement a <b>majority</b> of a professional development plan and addresses the professional development needs of <b>most the staff congruent with SBE-adopted instructional materials</b>.</p>	<p>Providing or brokering professional development in reading, language arts and math to implement <b>portions</b> of a staff development plan and that address the needs of a <b>limited number of staff</b>.</p>	<p>Providing or brokering professional development to address the staff development plan.</p>



## Question II Continued

Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified	Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified	Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory	Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified
The description provides <u>excellent evidence</u> , using specific examples and disaggregated schoolwide student achievement data, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence</u> , using examples and disaggregated student achievement data, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence</u> , mostly through <u>generalizations</u> , that the organization has staff with expertise in:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:
2(g) Having expertise and <b>human resources to support the effective implementation of demanding corrective actions/changes</b> either directly or brokered from other organizations.	Having expertise, or access to the expertise, and <b>human resources to support the implementation of the corrective actions/changes</b> either directly or brokered from other organizations.	Having <b>insufficient human resources to support the implementation of the corrective actions/changes</b> and having a marginal plan or unacceptable plan for obtaining the needed resources.	Having insufficient resources and/or ability to address the needs of underperforming schools and having no plan to obtain the needed resources.
2(h) Successfully analyzing school and district fiscal and human resource allocations to <b>make demanding recommendations</b> to maximize these resources to effectively implement and achieve the goals of the action plan.	Analyzing school and district fiscal and human resource allocations in order to <b>make appropriate recommendations</b> for reallocating resources to achieve the goals of the action plan.	Analyzing fiscal and human resource allocations in order to <b>make minor recommendations</b> for reallocating resources.	Analyzing school fiscal and human resource allocations to make recommendations for change.
2(i) Assisting schools in selecting from a wide variety of <b>research-based reform strategies that address the learning styles of all students, especially at-risk students</b> , and coaching teachers on implementing and evaluating the effectiveness of strategies in classroom instruction.	Assisting schools in selecting <b>research-based reform strategies that address multiple learning styles</b> and assisting in the implementation and appraisal of those strategies in classroom instruction.	Assisting schools in selecting <b>reform strategies that address different learning styles</b> .	Assisting schools in selecting reform strategies.

## Question II Continued

Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified	Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified	Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory	Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified
The description provides <u>excellent evidence</u> , using specific examples and disaggregated schoolwide student achievement data, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence</u> , using examples and disaggregated student achievement data, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence</u> , mostly through <u>generalizations</u> , that the organization has staff with expertise in:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence</u> that the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:
2(j) Assisting schools and teachers in analyzing data to <b>successfully develop and implement</b> schoolwide discipline and classroom management policies that enhance and improve the school's learning environment.	Assisting schools and teachers to <b>develop or implement</b> schoolwide discipline and classroom management policies that improve the school's learning environment.	Assisting schools in <b>developing</b> discipline & classroom management policies.	Assisting schools in developing policies.
2(k) Providing guidance, leadership and on-going mentoring to school and district personnel <b>to help "turn around" an underperforming school</b> . At least two years of disaggregated data is provided to demonstrate growth in student achievement (e.g. two years of STAR data and/or two years of district assessment data using at least four data points).	Providing guidance and leadership to school & district personnel <b>to improve student learning in an underperforming school</b> . At least one year of disaggregated data is provided (e.g., 3 student achievement data points over the course of 1 year, etc.)	Providing guidance to school and district personnel <b>to improve a school</b> (not specifically directed to student achievement).	Providing information to educational leaders on school improvement issues.
2(l/m) Effectively communicating, orally & in writing, to <b>inform diverse groups</b> (district & school administrators, teachers, staff, local board members, parents, students & community members) <b>of demanding changes</b> in school & district policy & practice.	Communicating, orally and in writing, <b>to inform a variety of groups of necessary changes</b> in school and district policy and practice.	Communicating <b>to groups about needed changes</b> in organizational policy and practice.	Communicating to groups.

III. What evidence demonstrates your organization's successful experience providing intensive support to help schools implement a focused standards-aligned academic program in reading/language arts and mathematics?

<b>Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified</b>
The description provides excellent <u>evidence, using specific examples</u> , that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:	The description provides <u>evidence using examples</u> that the organization has staff with demonstrated expertise in:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence, mostly through generalizations</u> , that the organization has staff with expertise in:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence that</u> the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:
3(a) <b>Successfully developing and securing agreement from all teachers to implement a pacing schedule</b> of the California's grade level content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.	<b>Securing agreement from most teachers to implement a pacing schedule</b> of the California's grade level content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.	<b>Securing agreement from some teachers or some grade levels to implement/pilot a pacing schedule.</b>	Securing agreement from teachers to implement pacing schedules.
3(b) Successfully implementing the <b>regular</b> use of a <b>consistent set of standards-based assessments that include performance benchmarks</b> across all grade levels in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Implementing the <b>use of a consistent set of standards-based assessment</b> across all grade levels in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Implementing the use or piloting the use of standards-based assessments in <b>some classrooms or grade levels</b> in reading/language arts or mathematics.	Implementing the use of standards-based assessments.
3(c). Developing and implementing an effective system that <b>promotes the regular use of student assessment data to systematically</b> inform and improve teaching and student learning of reading/language arts and mathematics within individual classrooms and across the grade levels.	Implementing a system that <b>promotes the use of student assessment data</b> to inform and improve teaching and student learning of reading/language arts and mathematics.	<b>Implementing</b> a system that promotes the <b>occasional use</b> of student assessments to inform teaching and learning in reading/language arts or mathematics.	Implementing the use of student assessment to inform and improve teaching and learning.

## Question III Continued

<b>Level 4</b> <b>Excellent Evidence:</b> <b>Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Adequate Evidence:</b> <b>Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Minimal Evidence:</b> <b>Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Insufficient Evidence:</b> <b>Unqualified</b>
<p>The description provides excellent <u>evidence, using specific examples</u>, that the organization has staff with demonstrated successful expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>evidence using examples</u> that the organization has staff with demonstrated expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>minimal evidence, mostly through generalizations</u>, that the organization has staff with expertise in:</p>	<p>The description provides <u>insufficient evidence that</u> the organization has staff with the necessary expertise in:</p>
<p>3(d) Successfully implementing <b>strategic</b> (for students less than 2 years below grade level) <b>and intensive</b> (for student 2 or more years below grade level) <b>interventions that accelerate progress to grade level standards in reading/language arts and mathematics</b>. Placement in intervention programs is based on a consistent set of assessments.</p>	<p>Implementing <b>strategic and intensive</b> intervention programs that accelerate progress to grade level standard in reading/language arts and math. Placement is based on assessments.</p>	<p>Implementing intervention programs that <b>are not consistently targeted to address students' specific learning deficits</b> (e.g., all students are placed in the same intervention program, intervention is homework assistance, etc.). Placement may not be based on a consistent set of assessments (e.g., teacher referral, various assessments may be used).</p>	<p>Implementing intervention programs in reading/language arts or math.</p>
<p>3(e) Successfully implementing and securing agreement from <b>all teachers</b> and site administrators to participate in the <b>regular monitoring of the progress</b> toward teaching to grade level standards in reading/language arts and mathematics using a common observation instrument.</p>	<p>Implementing and securing <b>agreement from most</b> teachers and site administrators to participate in <b>monitoring of the progress</b> toward teaching to grade level standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>	<p>Securing <b>agreement from some</b> teachers and site administrators to participate in <b>classroom observations</b>; however, observation may be subjective or not focused on the delivery of grade level standards.</p>	<p>Securing commitment from teachers and administrators to participate in the monitoring of progress.</p>

IV. Identify any individuals whom you plan to field as a “lead provider.” Provide a synopsis of this or her qualifications including: 1) experience working with specific grades spans as a teacher, counselor, administrator, content specialist, or coach, etc., 2) data that demonstrates specific expertise in improving reading/language arts and mathematics achievement in any low-performing schools; and 2) the amount of each individual’s time that will be committed to the SAIT work.

<b>Level 4 Excellent Evidence: Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3 Adequate Evidence: Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2 Minimal Evidence: Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1 Insufficient Evidence: Unqualified</b>
The description provides <u>excellent evidence, using disaggregated data and detailed information</u> that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence, using disaggregated data and sufficient information</u> , that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence, using limited data and marginal information</u> , that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence with no data provided</u> , that the SAIT Lead:
4(a) Has specific grade span experience as a teacher, counselor administrator, content specialist, or coach in two or more grade spans (e.g., elementary, middle, and/or high school).	Has specific grade span experience as a teacher, counselor, administrator, content specialist, or coach in at least one grade span.	Has worked in K-12 education, but not in a line position (e.g., providing staff development, data analysis, assessment support, etc.)	Has worked in K-12 education.
4(b) Has worked <b>in at least two or more low-performing schools</b> to improve student achievement (Low-performing is defined as schools in state decile ranks 1-5). (Decile rank of school is required.)	Has worked <b>with at least one low-performing school</b> to improve student achievement. (Decile rank of school is required.)	Has worked <b>with at least one school</b> , but not a low-performing school, to improve student achievement or implement school change	Has worked with a school to implement change.
4 (c) Has demonstrated, <b>using at least two years of disaggregated data</b> that the low-performing schools he/she worked with improved student achievement in <b>reading/language arts</b> .	Has demonstrated, <b>using at two years of disaggregated data or at least three disaggregated student achievement data points</b> over the course of one year, that the low-performing school he/she worked with improved student achievement in reading/language arts.	Has indicated, <b>using limited data (e.g., API data only)</b> , that the school he/she worked with improved student achievement in reading/language arts.	Has stipulated that the school he/she worked with improved student learning in reading/language arts. Insufficient or no data is provided.

## Question IV Continued

<b>Level 4</b> <b>Excellent Evidence:</b> <b>Highly or Well Qualified</b>	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Adequate Evidence:</b> <b>Qualified</b>	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Minimal Evidence:</b> <b>Not Satisfactory</b>	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Insufficient Evidence:</b> <b>Unqualified</b>
The description provides <u>excellent evidence, using disaggregated data and detailed information</u> that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>adequate evidence, using disaggregated data and sufficient information</u> , that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>minimal evidence, using limited data and marginal information</u> , that the SAIT Lead:	The description provides <u>insufficient evidence with no data provided</u> , that the SAIT Lead:
4(d) Has demonstrated, <b>using at least two years of disaggregated data</b> , that the low-performing schools he/she worked with improved student achievement in <b>mathematics</b> .	Has demonstrated improved student achievement in mathematics at a low-performing school <b>using at two years of disaggregated data or at least three disaggregated student achievement data points</b> , over the course of one year.	Has indicated, <b>using limited data (e.g., API data only)</b> , that the school he/she worked with improved student achievement in mathematics.	Has stipulated that the school he/she worked with improved student learning in mathematics. Insufficient or no data is provided.
4 (e) Has scheduled <b>sufficient time</b> to prepare, investigate, support and monitor for the number of teams the person will lead.	Has scheduled <b>adequate time</b> to prepare, investigate, support and monitor for the number of teams the person will lead.	Has scheduled an <b>inadequate amount of time</b> to prepare, investigate, support and monitor for the number of teams the person will lead.	Has scheduled an insufficient amount of time to lead the team(s).